



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

“within 500 or 700 yards of the Victoria Docks for the purpose of having the parts of the paddle-wheels which had been removed replaced there. The utmost despatch was used, and in 10 days the work was nearly complete, when she was burnt at her moorings. It was proved that the premium would have been the same with the principal London offices, whether the ship lay in the river or in the docks, but that in the Victoria Docks there were very careful precautions taken against fire—watchmen at all hours, and a numerous fire brigade, with an ample supply of water, and all the usual appliances for putting out fires; while in the river there were only three floating engines, between the arrival of the first of which and the breaking out of the fire nearly an hour had, in fact, elapsed. It was also proved that the work might as well have been done in the dock as in the river, but that the expense would have been much greater. The Court held that the Policy protected the vessel while in the Victoria Docks, or any dry dock, whether in the river or not, and notwithstanding that the latter might be at some distance from the former, and also while in transition, but that the risk was limited to the transit, and did not extend to the time during which the ship stopped in the river not for the purpose of that transit.”

We do not think it necessary to enter upon these questions in detail, nor to discuss further the nature and incidence of a Fire Policy, as, except in the particulars named, it is on all fours with a Policy of Life Assurance in its relation to the Law. Nor are we called on to speak at length as to the literary merits of the book. With the exception of an occasional “and which” left by inadvertence to grate on the ear, and the presence of one word, “*evilly-disposed*,” against which we really must enter our protest, there is happily little or nothing to call for criticism. On the other hand, there is all the well-known elegance and perspicuity of style of which Mr. Bunyon is so great a master, lending its charm to an intricate study, which is rendered the less difficult and unengaging by great clearness of arrangement and lucidity of illustration.

CORRESPONDENCE.

ON “TEN YEAR NONFORFEITURE POLICIES.”

To the Editor of the Journal of the Institute of Actuaries.

SIR,—Life policies under the above title are described in the July number of the *Journal* (p. 324) as having been largely issued in the United States.

The one point of novelty appertaining to them, is, that “if after two annual premiums have been paid, further payments are to be discontinued, the holder may, upon due surrender of the original policy in accordance with the rules of the Company, receive in lieu thereof a paid-up policy for as many tenth parts of the original sum insured as full annual premiums have been paid.”

It may be worth while to investigate the formula for the annual premium necessary to provide for such a risk, and also to examine to

what extent these assurances, in the absence of data as to the probability of surrender, are to be regarded as speculative,

Leaving out of view for a moment the restriction that two annual premiums must be paid before the policy can be surrendered, we will suppose that the surrender can take place at any time. Further, it is obvious that no person assured under this scheme would ask for a paid-up policy at any other time than when a premium became due. Let p_n be the probability at the time the n th renewal becomes payable, that the same will be paid:—then, x being the age at entry, the present value of the liability incurred by the Office at the commencement of each year will be as follows:—

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \text{1st year, } & \frac{M_x - M_{x+1}}{D_x} \\ \text{2nd ,, } & p_1 \frac{M_{x+1} - M_{x+2}}{D_x} + \frac{1}{10}(1-p_1) \frac{M_{x+1}}{D_x} \\ \text{3rd ,, } & p_1 p_2 \frac{M_{x+2} - M_{x+3}}{D_x} + \frac{2}{10} p_1 (1-p_2) \frac{M_{x+2}}{D_x} \\ & \vdots \\ \text{9th ,, } & p_1 p_2 \dots p_8 \frac{M_{x+8} - M_{x+9}}{D_x} + \frac{8}{10} p_1 p_2 \dots p_7 (1-p_8) \frac{M_{x+8}}{D_x} \\ \text{10th ,, } & p_1 p_2 \dots p_9 \frac{M_{x+9}}{D_x} + \frac{9}{10} p_1 p_2 \dots p_8 (1-p_9) \frac{M_{x+9}}{D_x} \end{aligned} \right\} \dots (1)$$

and if ω be the annual premium, the present value of all the premiums payable will be

$$\omega \left(1 + p_1 \frac{D_{x+1}}{D_x} + p_1 p_2 \frac{D_{x+2}}{D_x} \dots + p_1 p_2 \dots p_9 \frac{D_{x+9}}{D_x} \right) \dots (2)$$

The annual premium required will therefore be the sum of the expressions in (1) divided by the coefficient of ω in (2).

If in all that precedes we make $p_1=1$, the formulæ will then meet the case where two yearly premiums have to be paid before the privilege of surrender is allowed. In addition to making $p_1=1$ let us suppose $p_2=p_3=p_4 \dots = p_9$ and denote each of these by p , then (1) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{D_x} \left\{ M_x - M_{x+2} + p(M_{x+2} - M_{x+3}) + p^2(M_{x+3} - M_{x+4}) \dots + p^7(M_{x+8} - M_{x+9}) + p^8 M_{x+9} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (1-p) \left(\frac{2}{10} M_{x+2} + \frac{3}{10} p M_{x+3} \dots + \frac{8}{10} p^6 M_{x+8} + \frac{9}{10} p^7 M_{x+9} \right) \right\} \\ & = \frac{1}{D_x} \left\{ M_x - (1-p) \left(\frac{8}{10} M_{x+2} + \frac{7}{10} p M_{x+3} + \frac{6}{10} p^2 M_{x+4} \dots + \frac{1}{10} p^7 M_{x+9} \right) \right\} \dots (3) \end{aligned}$$

and (2) becomes

$$\frac{\omega}{D_x} (D_x + D_{x+1} + p D_{x+2} + p^2 D_{x+3} \dots + p^8 D_{x+9}) \dots (4)$$

The annual premium therefore in this case will be found by dividing the coefficient of $\frac{1}{D_x}$ in (3) by the coefficient of $\frac{\varpi}{D_x}$ in (4). The following table exhibits a few numerical values of ϖ , deduced from (3) and (4), corresponding to different assumed values of p . The Carlisle is the table of mortality used, and 3 per cent the rate of interest.

Age at entry.	Annual premium per cent.			
	$p=0.$	$p=\frac{1}{2}.$	$p=\frac{2}{3}.$	$p=1.$
30	4.881	4.867	4.834	4.769
40	5.856	5.848	5.808	5.697
50	6.738	6.749	6.760	6.745

It appears from these results, that when $p_1=1$, and the law of surrender is such that $p_2=p_3=p_4\ldots=p_9$, the amount of the annual premium is affected very little notwithstanding any change that may be made in the value of p . If the assumed law were known to be true we might conclude with certainty that there is no speculation involved in these assurances but such as might be amply covered by a properly constructed table of premiums. We cannot however tell at what rate surrenders might take place and it will therefore be desirable to examine further into the subject by making some important alteration in the supposed law and comparing the numerical results with those obtained already. Now experience shows that when a surrender takes place it is usually during the earlier years of a policy's existence and but very seldom after it has been in force a lengthened term. In choosing a second hypothesis we will therefore make the following suppositions, namely $p_1=1$, $p_2=p_3=p_4=p_5(=p)$, and $p_6=p_7=p_8=p_9=1$. In this case the present value of the Society's risk is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{D_x} \left\{ M_x - M_{x+2} + p(M_{x+2} - M_{x+3}) + p^2(M_{x+3} - M_{x+4}) + p^3(M_{x+4} - M_{x+5}) + p^4 M_{x+5} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (1-p) \left(\frac{2}{10} M_{x+2} + \frac{3}{10} p M_{x+3} + \frac{4}{10} p^2 M_{x+4} + \frac{5}{10} p^3 M_{x+5} \right) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{D_x} \left\{ M_x - (1-p) \left(\frac{8}{10} M_{x+2} + \frac{7}{10} p M_{x+3} + \frac{6}{10} p^2 M_{x+4} + \frac{5}{10} p^3 M_{x+5} \right) \right\} \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad (5) \end{aligned}$$

and the present value of the annual premiums is

$$\frac{\varpi}{D_x} \{ D_x + D_{x+1} + p D_{x+2} + p^2 D_{x+3} + p^3 D_{x+4} + p^4 (N_{x+4} - N_{x+9}) \} \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad (6)$$

The premium, ϖ , is therefore equal to the coefficient of $\frac{1}{D_x}$ in (5) divided by the coefficient of $\frac{\varpi}{D_x}$ in (6).

The following are numerical illustrations of the values of ϖ for various assumed values of p , using the same table of mortality and rate of interest as before.

Age at entry	Annual premium per cent.			
	$p=0.$	$p=\frac{1}{3}.$	$p=\frac{2}{3}.$	$p=1.$
30	4.881	4.865	4.820	4.769
40	5.856	5.843	5.782	5.697
50	6.738	6.748	6.752	6.745

We see from these figures that the variation in the amount of the yearly premium for different values of p is very trifling, and we see moreover, on comparing these figures with those before found that notwithstanding the considerable change made in the suppositions as to surrender, the annual premium is as nearly as possible the same. We may conclude from these results that it is at least highly probable that in such contracts as we have been considering, the speculative element under any circumstances is extremely small.

When $p_1=1$ and $p_2=0$ we get from (1) and (2) $\omega = \frac{M_x - \frac{4}{5}M_{x+2}}{D_x + D_{x+1}}$,

and when $p_1=p_2=p_3\dots=p_9=1$ we find $\omega = \frac{M_x}{N_{x-1} - N_{x+9}}$, the latter being the ordinary formula when a whole life assurance is paid for by ten equal annual premiums.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

316, Regent Street,
26th Sept., 1868.

SAMUEL YOUNGER.

* * We readily give insertion to the above letter on a subject which is not only of theoretical interest but may become of some practical importance. We should have preferred, however, to see the numerical examples worked out by the Experience Table, instead of the Carlisle, when probably some of the irregularities in the results would have disappeared. We should be glad now to see the question treated in another way, viz. by a comparison of the amount of the paid-up policy which the value of the policy would purchase, according to the office single premiums, with the amount of that granted under the regulations quoted above.—ED. J. I. A.

ON A FORMULA IN THE CALCULUS OF FINITE DIFFERENCES.

To the Editor of the Journal of the Institute of Actuaries.

SIR,—I am not about to enter upon the consideration of a theory proposed by some writers, that all mathematical evidence resolves into a perception of identity, and that mathematical propositions are only diversified expressions of the simple formula, $a=a$.^{*} It must however be admitted

^{*} The following is quoted by Dugald Stewart ("Philosophy of the human mind," part 2, cap. 1) from a writer on the subject referred to. *Omnes Mathematicorum propositiones sunt identicae et repræsentantur hac formulâ, $a=a$.* He adds, "This sentence, which I quote from a dissertation published at Berlin about 50 years ago" (1813), "expresses in a few words what seems to be now the prevailing opinion (more particularly on the Continent) concerning the nature of Mathematical evidence."